Saskatchewan
Education

Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages

April, 1986

86-03998/

REPORT OF THE MINISTER'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE LANGUAGES

April, 1986

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Members of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages

Daniel Bodnar
Teacher
Foam Lake

Professor Sonia Cipywynk
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan

Margaret Freund
Teacher
Saskatoon

Dr. Gunter Kocks
Chairperson
Faculty of Arts
University of Regina

Felix Kryzanowski
Community College
Humboldt

Cathy Luciuk
Parent and Teacher
Ukrainian Saturday School
Regina

Armand Martin
Department of Culture and Recreation
Regina

Helga Neiboj
Teacher
German Language School
Regina

Lucia Papini,
Vice-Chairperson
Teacher
Regina

Dr. George Richert
Faculty of Education
University of Regina

Avra Watson
Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

George Zerebecky
Multicultural Consultant
Department of Education

The Committee would like to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

- Ken Hepp, Saskatchewan Education, who oversaw local arrangements, finalized promotional literature and informed the media, directors and principals about meetings in their jurisdictions.

- The Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan, which assisted in informing groups about local meeting arrangements.

- Numerous individuals who acted as local contact people, registrars and recorders.

Particular appreciation is extended to the following individuals:

- Jim Gillett, who did the final analysis of the data from the community meetings; compiled and edited the Interim and Final Reports; and typed several drafts of the Final Report, the recommendations and supporting documentation.

- Raissa Cipywnyk and Rupal Thakkar, students at the University of Saskatchewan, who assisted in the data compilation and analysis phase of the project.

- Carole Sunley, Secretary, University of Saskatchewan, Shirley McKay, Gerri Brickett, and Jan Gillett who provided clerical and typing assistance.

The sub-committee that assumed responsibility for the preparation of the Final Report and the Recommendations included: Sonia Cipywnyk (chair), Armand Martin, George Richert, and George Zerebecky. The tasks of data analysis, documentation and compilation of the interim and final documents were overseen by the Chair.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
RATIONALE	1
CONTEXT	7
REPORT ON COMMUNITY MEETINGS	13
Summary	13
Background	14
Historical Overview for ACOHL Committee	14
Rationale for Heritage Language Instruction and Community Meetings	17
Community Meetings	18
Planning and Preparation	18
Summary and Findings	19
RECOMMENDATIONS	29

RATIONALE

The Goals of Education for Saskatchewan statement, released by the Minister of Education (October, 1984), clearly states that the attainment of these goals is a shared community responsibility, involving the school, home and church.[1] Thus, community participation in setting educational directions is a desired step in the process of establishing policies and programs.

In summarizing its recommendations (Directions: The Final Report), the Curriculum and Instructional Review Committee acknowledged that, while Saskatchewan has a good system of education, there are indications that some students needs are not being met. The province's diverse population and the many varied needs of its children suggest that the education system strive to better respond to student aspirations.[2] The initiative taken by the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages, in seeking public opinion on heritage language education, represents one attempt at identifying the needs and aspirations of Saskatchewan's diverse population and, through the process, facilitating public participation in an aspect of schooling.

Saskatchewan has a commitment to promote and provide for official and heritage language programs.[3] Members of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages undertook to inform themselves about the political, social, economic, organizational and educational dimensions of heritage language instruction.

Considerable research and internal deliberation resulted in the formulation of a statement of rationale intended to provide an operational framework for the committee's work. Of equal importance was the value of the statement as a point of reference for public meetings, where it served as a 'reality-check' on heritage language expectations for Saskatchewan people.

---

1. Goals of Education for Saskatchewan, 1984.
2. Directions: The Final Report, p. 7
3. The Statement of Minority Language Education in the Provinces and Territories of Canada, Report by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, January, 1983, p. 59.

The Committee's statement of rationale has five component parts. These follow in bold print, along with relevant direct quotations obtained from public meetings, written submissions and public statements. This display demonstrates the level of congruence between the Committee's rationale statement and public perceptions of the role of heritage language education.

1. **Saskatchewan's strength and uniqueness derives directly from its linguistic and cultural diversity. The teaching of heritage languages is basic to the realization of a politically just and socially harmonious multicultural society.**

   "Heritage languages are the essence of every culture and identity, and a blend of these cultures then forms an alloy of strength, beauty and pride. Let us practice what we profess, that a person's contribution to his community and his country is directly proportional to his sense of well-being and sense of identity."

   "The Department of Education must publicly sanction heritage language instruction. It must also be made perfectly clear that this is a right of parents."

   "Knowing that our culture and language are inseparable, we are requesting your assurance that proper funding of our language programs be maintained through our tax dollars."

   The 'cultures' of heritage groups should be reflected accurately in school curricula."

   "Great civilizations and little minds cannot exist together. We have the possibility before us of a free and abundant life. We cannot achieve this unless we strengthen every sound element in the structure of our society. Among these elements is the unused, uncultivated and undeveloped linguistic resources of our people."--G.W. Simpson, Professor Emeritus of History, University of Saskatchewan

2. **Component groups in a multicultural society function and co-exist more effectively when their heritage languages and cultures are recognized and appreciated. Multilingual education promotes the development of a world view that fosters intercultural communication and understanding.**

"The teaching of a secondary language will result in an appreciation of other cultural aspects closely related to the language and as such result in intercultural understanding and, to some degree, international understanding and good will. This would seem as a good investment in the future of our country."

"The idea that assimilation was the 'key' to a united country is very narrow and without foundation. Forcing or encouraging the loss of identity of our citizens is not to be and cannot be condoned, and the surest way to cause one to lose his or her identity is to remove the opportunity to learn and maintain the language of one's forefathers."

3. The teaching of heritage languages facilitates individual and societal participation and interaction in world economic activity. In this sense, heritage languages are a renewable natural resource.

"Furthermore, as it becomes increasingly more incumbent on our society to be more global in our outlook and outreach, the practical value of being able to communicate in languages other than our own official languages becomes increasingly more apparent."

"As members of an international society it is important to learn more than the two official languages for business reasons."

"We believe that the learning of a second or third language has definite economic benefits. In today's tight job market any extra skill that our children have affords them a better chance."

"The study of second languages makes good economic sense."

"We recognize the absolute necessity in the international commercial battle we face ... as traders, we in Western Canada increasingly recognize the need to speak several international languages. We kick ourselves for not realizing it thirty years ago, when it would have been easy because of our ethnic diversity." --President Lloyd Barber, University of Regina, 1984.

4. A delivery system is needed for the teaching of heritage languages. Schools have been legitimately charged with this responsibility, because they provide appropriate instructional personnel and facilities accessible to all students.

"Schools should offer the heritage language that the community wants."

"Heritage languages should be offered in the school system."

"Encourage school boards to co-operate in offering heritage language classes."

"School boards and administrators must be more receptive to the wishes of parents."

"That in-school programs, upon the request of parents or heritage language organizations, and where numbers warrant, be established."

"The question arises, 'Where is the best environment for the teaching and learning process found?' The answer is, of course, in our school system where the machinery is already essentially in place."

"Programs of heritage languages to be taught in schools as part of the required curriculum."

"Since the schools already have the facilities it is the best possible place to hold these classes."

"We feel that the school already has trained people to teach so its is obvious the instruction of language is best carried out by the professional teaching staff."

"The onus of setting up programs should fall on the three school boards in this area and not with the parents."

"We recommend that in order to prevent costs of heritage language programs from being prohibitive to an individual that the Departments of Education and Culture and Recreation share (combine) funding for heritage language programs."

"Visible official support for heritage language instruction serves to legitimize the language in the eyes of the public and contributes to positive attitudes toward heritage languages."

5. The study of heritage languages is an educative process which develops cognitive skills, acts as a stimulant for other studies and provides a tool for understanding one's own culture and the cultures of others. Schools reach children at an age when second language acquisition and attitudinal change are most effectively accomplished.

"The acquisition of a second language not only introduces another store of knowledge; it also serves to raise the level of understanding of the first language."

"Memory skills are improved, the grammar of one's own language is learned better, and the choice of words in any language is improved."

"Most of the people in the world speak more than one language."

"He (Marcel Vanesi) has found that the academic advantages of such learning reveal ...

- ' improvement in the majority language after being enrolled in a heritage language'
- ' increased ability in conceptual and creative thinking'
- ' sensitivity to the communicative needs of their interlocutors'
- ' training also facilitated the learning of additional languages'."

"The study of languages for language sake has great educational benefits. It develops better thinking skills, promotes understanding of other ethnocultural groups and contributes to a sense of identity for our young people."

"Besides--a second language builds a better brain. If you give a child the chance to start to make a frame for another language, you have altered his whole mechanism within the brain. He will have a better capacity for learning."
"Heritage languages should be taught because this reinforces other learnings."

"The teaching of German language in Saskatchewan is not solely for the purpose of communication, but should also provide an awareness, understanding and appreciation of the German speaking people's heritage and cultures."

"There is not one current study of second language instruction conducted in North America or Western Europe which shows that a child studying a second language is negatively affected by those studies."

CONTEXT

In Saskatchewan, three major ways of providing heritage language instruction can be distinguished:

1. out-of-school programs operated by ethnocultural communities usually with (since 1974) Saskatchewan Culture and Recreation and federal financial support. Most of these programs provide non-credit instruction, for several hours a week after regular school hours or in summer language camp settings. A limited number have negotiated accreditation of their programs or offer high school credit courses either during the school year or in the form of intensive summer school sessions.

2. core in-school programs funded by Saskatchewan Education and school boards, in which the heritage language is taught as a subject during regular school hours. Core German instruction has been available to high school students since 1913. Ukrainian courses at the secondary level have had credit status since 1951. Since 1968, when second-language instruction underwent a shift from a "grammar and literature" to a "conversation" approach, and was moved down first to grade 7, then to grades 4 and 1, the Department has funded German and Ukrainian Curriculum Committees. Government Correspondence School courses are available in both German and Ukrainian. Both are currently being revised.

3. bilingual programs within the regular school system, in which a heritage language may be used as a medium of instruction for a maximum of 50% of the school day. The Education Act was amended in 1974 and again in 1978 to permit the establishment of such partial immersion programs.

Each of these types of program was addressed during the deliberations of ACOHL and the community meetings held in the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985. Each is seen as meeting the varied needs of communities differing in ethnic composition and other demographic characteristics.

Thus, even where in-school core or bilingual instruction is viable, out-of-school programs are seen as serving a set of essentially complementary functions, and any lessening of administrative, consultative, and financial support for their operation was viewed with alarm.

Indeed, what is envisaged is a strengthening and upgrading of the instructional and curricular aspects of out-of-school programs, irrespective of the department in which they may be housed.

Concerns expressed regarding the development and articulation of elementary and secondary core language programs are rooted in a strong conviction that the possibilities inherent in core language instruction have not been fully recognized and developed. They also reflect a growing awareness of the fact that, although the Department of Education in this province has historically viewed its role with respect to instructional support as confined to program (curriculum) development as distinct from the development of instructional and resource materials, other departments have tended to define their responsibilities in somewhat broader terms. Whatever the general position of Saskatchewan Education may be, an argument can be made for a higher and different level of support and involvement in the case of certain heritage languages for which instructional and resource materials are not readily available.

It was the issue of departmental commitment to bilingual heritage language programs, however, that emerged as a particularly cogent and urgent concern. Public awareness of interprovincial differences in this regard are documented in several briefs presented by the Ukrainian community. The differences identified are not confined to direct and indirect financial and consultative support; their thrust is the more subtle yet pivotal matter of legitimation of language preservation and development efforts.

Enabling legislation permitting the use of heritage languages for instructional purposes has been in place since 1971 in Alberta, 1974 in Saskatchewan, and 1978 in Manitoba. The initial efforts to effect changes with respect to language-of-instruction clauses in the acts governing education were made by the Ukrainian community in each province. To this extent the history of partial immersion heritage language instructional programs in the three prairie provinces is similar. Population dispersion and administrative variables alone cannot account for the subsequent differential success of such programs in three provinces with highly similar demographic characteristics. The enrollment figures summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3 reflect, at least in part, a significantly different interpretation and understanding of the general role and specific responsibilities of Departments of Education in the development and implementation of bilingual programs.

When the Government of Alberta made a commitment to the Ukrainian-English Bilingual Program in 1974, it provided $70,000 per year for a three-year pilot project. Since then, funding has been made available for a Curriculum Development Officer, a Learning Resources Officer, an editor-translator (half-time), secretarial help (two full-time positions), a program developer (1985-86), and a social studies project coordinator (1985-86).

Similarly, in 1979, the Government of Manitoba committed $70,000 a year for three years to support the establishment of three pilot bilingual classes. The costs covered included teacher in-service training sessions. As well, a half-time Ukrainian-consultant position in the Department of Education was converted to a full-time position.

Except for program initiation and transportation grants, and a minor program development grant to the Saskatoon Separate School Board, the Government of Saskatchewan has not provided any substantial support to Ukrainian bilingual programming. The Multicultural Education Consultant's efforts in this respect have been supplemented, in the past year, by the short-term temporary appointment of a Curriculum Development Officer in the Department of Education. This evidence of support, while acknowledged and appreciated by the Ukrainian community, can best be viewed as a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for the expansion of Heritage Language Core and Bilingual Programming in this province.

Table 1: Enrollments in Heritage Language Partial Immersion Programs in Alberta Schools, 1983-84

Program	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totals
English-Ukrainian	198	218	190	212	144	131	106	66	65	48	39			1412
English-Hebrew	*	82	83	85	89	77	81	32	25	31				585
English-Yiddish	*	18	11	10	12	9	9							70
English-German	*	61	50	27	33	27								198
English-Arabic	*	43												43
English-Mandarin	*	37												37
														2309

Note. * figures not availble

Source: Alberta. Alberta Education. (n.d.). 1983-84 Statistics Regarding the Number Students Enrolled in Classes in Which Instruction is Offered in a Language Other Than English or French as Permitted by Section 159 (1)(b) of the School Act

Table 2: Enrollments in Heritage Language Partial Immersion Programs in Manitoba Schools, 1983-84

Program	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Totals
English-Ukrainian	150	151	123	102	104	80		710
Engish-German	78	71	73	56				278
English-Hebrew	31	27	21					79
								1067

Source: Manitoba. Department of Education. (n.d.). Teaching of Second Languages in Manitoba Schools During the School Year 1983-84

Table 3: Enrollments in Heritage Language Partial Immersion Programs in Saskatchewan Schools, 1983-84

Program	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
English-Ukrainian	13	18	15	15	12			73

Source: Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Education. (n.d.). Ukrainian-English Bilingual Program: Yearly Enrolment Statistics, St. Goretti School, Saskatoon

"As commendable and necessary as these legislative changes were, they represent only an initial phase in the process of undoing 64 years of discriminatory educational practice dedicated solely to unilingual instruction. This process involves attitudinal changes which cannot be legislated. However, government can act to effect such changes by providing:

1. a positive, publicly visible endorsement of the concept of bilingual education,
2. practical support for the legislation, namely: strategies, structures, and personnel.

The Saskatchewan Government has never followed through in facilitating the procedures whereby this legislation is translated into viable programs. This is in contrast with the Manitoba experience where, in 1979, the Provincial Government took an immediate and active role in promoting Ukrainian-English Bilingual education by almost totally funding three pilot bilingual programs for a three year period. It is also in contrast with Alberta's experience where similar commitment to a three year Ukrainian-English Bilingual pilot program was made by the Government of Alberta as early as 1974.

Therefore, in both of these provinces legislation received a high profile and concrete financial support in establishing the necessary strategies, structures, and personnel. Enrollment figures of Ukrainian-English bilingual programs in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta, (See Tables 1, 2 and 3), demonstrate how positive government action effects attitudes thereby increasing the interest and enrollment in Ukrainian-English bilingual education. This concept is best exemplified in the federal-provincial initiatives in promoting French Language education.

The provincial Council has consistently promoted the inherent value of bilingual education, and its efforts have had some success. However, a community based organization cannot do those things which are within the mandate of government, namely establish the supportive strategies, structures, and personnel required for bilingual education. Active government is therefore essential" (Excerpt from the Ukrainian Canadian Committee - Provincial Council's Brief to Premier Grant Devine and the Cabinet of the Government of Saskatchewan, 1983)

REPORT ON COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Summary

Between November 20, 1984 and April 30, 1985 the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages (ACOHL) held public meetings in eighteen communities across the province. The meetings were intended to explore community views on heritage language instruction and to assist the Minister in long-range planning by investigating three broad areas:

1. ways of developing a more responsive role for schools that serve a community with a distinct ethnic population
2. increasing the numbers of qualified heritage language teachers, and
3. matters in which intergovernmental co-operation could benefit heritage language programming.

In all, 44 briefs were submitted along with 5 petitions containing a total of 350 names. All of the petitions came from Ukrainian groups who called for support of Ukrainian language programs and schools in the province. The briefs came from Ukrainian (18) and German (7) groups, from concerned individuals (8), and from local and provincial ethnic, multilingual, and multicultural organizations representing over a dozen different language groups.

The meetings succeeded in identifying the major concerns across the province with respect to heritage language programming. These concerns included:

1. a desire that the government, in particular the Department of Education, give a higher profile to heritage languages and better inform the general public about the availability and benefits of heritage language instruction.
2. concerns related to intergovernmental and interdepartmental co-operation and to policy and funding for heritage language programming
3. concerns related to the formal training of teachers and to the reinstatement of language requirements by the province's two universities, and
4. a variety of attitudinal, administrative, personnel, and resource-related barriers to program implementation.

Background

Historical Overview of ACOHL Committee

In late 1977 an Advisory Committee on Minority Languages was struck by the Honorable Don Faris, Minister of Education. The committee's terms of reference were:

1. To provide recommendations to the Minister of Education concerning minority language education (other than French) in Saskatchewan with respect to
   (a) provincial policy on curriculum and standards for elementary and secondary school programs
   (b) appropriate financial support
   (c) teacher training and supply
   (d) needed regional developments involving inter-unit co-operation
   (e) changes in legislation and regulations
2. To consider and advise the Minister of Education on matters referred to it by the Minister
3. Subject to budgetary approval, to carry out such studies as it considers advisable on matters directly related to minority languages education (other than French) in the province, and to report its findings and recommendations arising from such studies to the Minister of Education.

The committee met periodically in 1978. Meetings focused their attention on several areas identified as being of concern: teacher training; the goals of second language learning and multicultural education; compulsory versus optional language courses; the optimal age and grade for beginning language instruction; issues related to funding, the adequacy of legislative provisions and departmental regulations; the need to disseminate information about the benefits of second language learning; and the need to strike a balance between "the ideal" and reality.

In the spring of 1980, after a hiatus of more than a year, committee members met with the Deputy Minister of Education to discuss the Committee's continued existence. The response of the Minister, the Honorable Doug McArthur, was positive and the committee was reconstituted in the fall of 1981 as the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages (ACOHL). The committee's new terms of reference were stated as follows:

> The committee is established mainly to provide the Minister with recommendations in response to questions that he may from time to time direct to the committee

> Within the general framework of multicultural education, the committee will be concerned with issues associated with the provision of educational opportunities in Saskatchewan schools in heritage languages other than French and English.
>
> Although the committee will normally be responsible for providing advice based on its internal deliberations, it may be requested to conduct or co-ordinate studies, hold hearings or receive briefs, or become actively involved in program promotion.
>
> Notwithstanding the responsibility of the committee to deal with specific assignments from the Minister, the committee will meet once a year for a review of general issues. Following the meeting the committee may submit suggestions to the Minister about issues that, in the view of the committee, need to be examined.

During the first few months of ACOHL's existence the committee updated and consolidated its knowledge base with respect to: provincial legislation and departmental regulations; federal programs, funding policies, trends in in-school and out-of-school language program involvements; core and bilingual heritage language programs in Alberta and Manitoba; research on core, extended core, bilingual and immersion language programs; teacher preparation and certification; interprovincial co-operation with respect to teacher training, program development, and the preparation of resource materials; the interagency approach used to train teachers, develop curriculum guides and upgrade heritage language instruction in supplementary (or Saturday) schools under the aegis of the Department of Culture and Recreation; the recommendations of the Social Studies Task Force and the Rural Education Report; the thrust of the Saskatchewan Discussion Paper on "Culture and Language"; and the foci of the "Issues in Schooling" discussion paper released by the Curriculum Review Committee. During this time the committee also made the first of a series of requests for additional committee members so that it could more adequately deal with its perceived mandate.

The Department's first specific assignment for the committee (May, 1981) was entitled "The School and Its Community." The task required that the committee assess the current status of heritage language instruction in the province and identify any concerns that might exist. In preparation for the task the committee undertook to inform itself about the political, social, organizational and

educational contexts of heritage language instruction. Specific terms and issues examined over the next few months included multicultural education, the nature of the committee's relationship to various organizations and agencies concerned with heritage language education, the need for the committee to strike a balance between "informing " and "advocating," and the desirability of formulating recommendations based on information derived from an examination of pertinent research and community consultations.

A modified Nominal Group Technique yielded a list of five priorities from which the group developed an action plan to address the assignment. The plan called for the committee to:

- determine working definitions for relevant terminology
- establish a clear statement of rationale for heritage languages education
- keep current with developments in heritage languages instruction in the province and strive to identify particular strengths and weaknesses. Such an analysis would assist in determining any policy recommendations.
- develop a strategy for collecting and analyzing the type of data needed in order to deal with the issues identified in the assignment
- cost out an operating budget for the proposed action, including expenses for implementing the above-mentioned strategy, and
- forward policy recommendations based on analysis of all relevant data

In the spring of 1983 the Honourable Gordon Currie confirmed the mandate of ACOHL and expanded its membership. In June of 1983 the committee, as its second task, was asked to address the following questions generated by a Ukrainian Canadian Committee (UCC) brief to the Minister of Education:

1. What is the relative weighting or emphasis that should be placed on bilingual programs (up to 50% instruction in a language other than English), core courses of studies, and Saturday schools for elementary school-aged children?
2. How much information and advocacy should there be aimed at the establishment of language instruction offerings? If such a function is desired, should it be located in a government department? How much and what sort of initiative should heritage groups be expected to take?
3. What are some guidelines regarding provincial versus interprovincial curriculum development?
4. What are some guidelines regarding provision of instructional materials?

The committee's response (December, 1983) to the UCC brief was positive. It commended the process followed, concurred with the rationale behind the request for a Curriculum Development Officer for bilingual Ukrainian-English curriculum development, and supported the principle of government funding of community initiatives. Its advice to the Minister was that the requested appointment of a Ukrainian Bilingual Program Curriculum Development Officer be approved, and that the related requests for Language Animators and Community Resources Consultants be directed to the Department of Culture and Recreation. (The term position actually created included responsibilities for both language animation and curriculum development). In June of 1984 the committee passed a related recommendation requesting that "a development consultant be sought for (a) German, and (b) other heritage languages in order that the same service be rendered to these groups as to the Ukrainian community, in order to anticipate emerging public demand for increased institutional support and services."

In the fall of 1983 a Regina sub-committee undertook the task of developing a brochure that would legitimate and raise the profile of ACOHL. Preliminary drafts were prepared, reviewed and discussed with appropriate departmental personnel. Attempts to obtain final approval to print informational brochures were deferred until the committee adopted a "larger action plan." Eventually, the brochure material was incorporated into a Chronicle Supplement in the fall of 1984.

Rationale for Heritage Language Instruction and Community Meetings

The need for a basis for advising the Minister with respect to precedent/policy issues such as those implicit in the UCC brief led the committee to devote several sessions to one of the tasks that it had set for itself in December, 1982--the development of a rationale for heritage language instruction in the province. The preliminary work of the committee as a whole and of Saskatoon sub-committee struck to prepare a draft of the rationale was completed in December, 1983 and forwarded to the Minister for her consideration.

In the spring of 1984, at the committee's request, ACOHL met with the Honourable Patricia Smith, Minister of Education. After a brief review of the role of the committee, the Minister received several questions concerning the draft policy statement on the rationale for heritage language instruction in Saskatchewan. The

Minister indicated that she would consider these questions and that she would respond to them in another meeting or by letter.

A response from the Minister was received in May, 1984. The response raised a number of concerns and issues which were subsequently addressed in an extensive statement draw up by the Saskatoon sub-committee and subsequently approved by ACOHL. The Saskatoon sub-committee's response to the Minister also included operational plans for a series of community meetings on heritage language teaching in Saskatchewan schools. The meetings were intended to explore community views on heritage language instruction and to assist the Minister in long-range planning by investigating three broad areas:

1. ways of developing a more responsive role for schools that serve a community with a distinct ethnic population
2. increasing the numbers of qualified heritage language teachers, and
3. matters in which intergovernmental co-operation could benefit the heritage language programming.

The plan for community meetings received ministerial approval in the summer of 1984.

Community Meetings

Planning and Preparation

Committee members agreed that ACOHL hold public meetings where there was an active or perceived potential interest in heritage language instruction. With this in mind, twenty communities were selected. Meetings were held in eighteen of these communities on the dates indicated below:

Tuesday, November 20, 1984
- Canora
- Hudson Bay
- Kamsack

Wednesday, November 21, 1984
- Foam Lake
- Melville
- Yorkton

Tuesday, February 5, 1985
- Regina (2 sessions)
- Moose Jaw
- Swift Current

Monday, February 25, 1985
- Saskatoon (2 sessions)
- Cudworth
- Rosthern

Tuesday, February 26, 1985
- Humboldt

Tuesday, March 5, 1985
- Kerrobert

Tuesday, April 2, 1985
- Prince Albert
- Nipawin

Tuesday, April 30, 1985
- North Battleford
- Blaine Lake

Where possible, the dates for the community meetings were set to minimize conflict with local and provincial events. It is important to note that human and financial restraints on the committee made it impossible to conduct any broader public review.

In preparation for the community meetings, ACOHL members set up public meeting teams, reviews ACOHL's mandate, studied the background materials prepared by a Saskatoon sub-committee, clarified their role with respect to receiving and providing information, and discussed the importance of maintaining a positive but neutral stance as distinct from assuming an advocacy position.

The Department took on the task of overseeing local arrangements, finalizing promotional literature, arranging for media promotion, and informing directors and principals about the meetings scheduled in their jurisdictions. The Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan agreed to assist with the task of informing groups about the meetings scheduled in a given geographical areas. A special Chronicle Supplement prepared by a Regina sub-committee was issued in October, 1984, a month prior to the first community meeting. The brochure was intended to serve both an informational and promotional function. It included the mandate of ACOHL, the purpose of the community meetings, the questions/issues that interested individuals and groups might branch, and the dates and locations of the scheduled meetings. In addition to its usual distribution, this issue of the Chronicle Supplement was also included in the registration kits of the participants in the fall Heritage Language Teacher Training Workshop sponsored by the Regina Multicultural Council, Saskatoon Multicultural Council, and the Multilingual Association of Regina, and jointly funded by the Department of Culture and Recreation and the Department of the Secretary of State; the 21st Century Ukrainian Conference sponsored by the Saskatchewan Council of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee (November, 1984); and the annual conferences of two Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation Special Subject Councils: The Saskatchewan Association of Teachers of German and the Saskatchewan Teachers of Ukrainian.

Summary and Findings

In all, 44 briefs were submitted along with 5 petitions containing a total of 350 names. All of the petitions came from Ukrainian groups who called for support of Ukrainian language programs and schools in the province. The briefs came from Ukrainian (18) or German (7) groups,

from concerned individuals (8), and from local and provision ethnic, multilingual and multicultural organizations representing over a dozen different language groups.

Tables 4 and 5 give a more complete breakdown of each community meeting, including the numbers in attendance, the number of briefs and petitions submitted, the names of presenters, and the groups or organizations on whose behalf the briefs were delivered.

Each meeting followed a similar pattern. The chairperson introduced the committee, clarified the intent of the meeting, and went through the Chronicle Supplement. A second committee member served as a resource person and/or flip chart recorder. Where possible, persons living in the community were contacted to be registrars and/or secretaries. These people greeted individuals; obtained the names, addressed and affiliations of those present; obtained information on who would be giving briefs and the approximate length of each presentation; and, where possible, served as secretaries for minutes of meetings.

At most of the meetings recorders listed (on flip charts) issues raised by presenters. Where no briefs were read, comments made during discussion were recorded in a similar manner. Subject to the agreement of all present, related points were collapsed. From the list of issues that had been discussed, those present at each meeting were then asked to individually rank what they considered to be the top five issues.

Members of the media were contacted initially by mail and later by telephone with regard to the times and locations of meetings in their area. Since the Department chose not to purchase advertising space, few newspapers printed the publicity material. Twelve of the 18 sessions were covered by members of the media.

After the first set of meetings (Canora, Hudson Bay, Kamsack) committee members met in Yorkton to share their experience, identify problems, and review strategies and procedures. Low attendance in Kamsack and Hudson Bay was attributed largely to a "definite lack of promoting the public meetings", particularly on the part of directors of education and the media. Given the Department's decision to confine its promotional efforts to distributing the Chronicle Supplement, and to sending the local media and directors of education additional information, the committee was forced to rely on personal, ethnic group, and Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan contacts to

inform potentially interested individuals and groups about meetings in their area. Serious concern about the issue of publicity was expressed at most of the meetings, with a number of individuals concluding that the Department was not proceeding in good faith. The problems inherent in adequate promotional strategies plagued the committee throughout the hearings, and was never resolved to its satisfaction.

After all of the community meetings had been held, ACOHL members reviewed the findings and determined that the recommendations and points made during the meetings could be classified according to 10 broad categories:

1. higher profile for heritage languages
2. formal training for teachers
3. access to facilities
4. funding
5. support services
6. programming
7. rationale for heritage language programming
8. university involvement
9. inter/intragovernmental co-operation
10. policy

Close examination of the number of responses within each category and the subsequent ranking of each category (see Table 6) reveals several interesting trends. First, it appears that the major issue across the province with respect to heritage languages is the desire that the Department of Education give a higher profile to heritage languages and better inform the general public about the availability and benefits of heritage language instruction:

> "The Department of Education should be involved in a public relations effort designed to make the general public aware of the availability of heritage language programs."--Cudworth
>
> "We recommend that K-12 heritage language program availability be made known to the public. Public information dissemination must exist from Department of Education to public."--Moose Jaw
>
> "The Department of Education must publicly sanction heritage language instruction. It must also be made perfectly clear that this is a right of parents."

Comments to this effect came from nearly all the communities in which public hearings were held.

Second, concerns related to intergovernmental and intradepartmental co-operation, and to policy and funding for heritage language programming were the next issues of concern to most groups. Each of these issues received about equal emphasis.

> "Intergovernmental (provincial and federal) co-operation in heritage language teaching could prove to be very beneficial to all concerns."--Regina, session 2
>
> "All heritage language instruction should be under one government department."--Humboldt
>
> "Heritage language instruction should begin very early--in kindergarten and grades one and two."--Humboldt
>
> "The Department of Education should provide permanent funding for supplementary (out-of-school) heritage language programs."--Swift Current

Third, the formal training of teachers and the involvement of the universities in heritage language issues were areas of concern in most communities. Each received equal emphasis:

> "Teacher training institutions should provide methodology courses in the teaching of heritage languages and cultures."--Canora
>
> "The language requirement for university entrance should be reinstated."--Saskatoon, session 1

It is interesting to note that when the major concerns from Saskatoon and Regina re compared to those from across the province, the results are almost identical. For example, of the six major issues with regard to heritage languages in the cross-the-province meetings, five reappeared amongst the top six issues in the Regina and Saskatoon meetings.

In addition to the briefs, discussion, and the ranking of issues at each public meeting, individuals at the meetings were free to turn in response sheets on which they could indicate any questions or concerns they might have about language opportunities in their area of the province. 243 response sheets were turned in. As well as the usual congratulatory comments, the response sheets contained a number of remarks with respect to: advertising for the meetings, school board co-operation, summer language

camps, smaller ethnocultural groups, the inherent value of heritage language instruction, the weighting of recommendations in locations where the meetings had been poorly attended, and the continued lack of action in implementing heritage language programs. Two post meeting letters expressing concerns about procedural matters were received and responded to by Department officials.

> "We could not find an ad in the paper and found it difficult to discover where and at what time the meeting would be held . . .."--Hudson Bay
>
> "Summer language camps provide for continuation of language instruction throughout the summer months when language instruction tends to come to a standstill. Some initiative should be taken by the Board of Education to insure that these programs continue."--Saskatoon, session 1
>
> "We would like to indicate the value of the heritage language programs in existence and ones that might develop and grow in the future. The cognitive, sociocultural, and even economic values that the programs have, make it critical that the programs continue."--Saskatoon, session 2
>
> "My greatest concern is that with such small numbers present, results of a survey do not show a fair assessment of 'wants' or 'needs' of a fairly large community."--Melville
>
> "My daughter is now in grade 6. When she started school we were sent a form asking if we wanted Ukrainian in the school. Nothing. Then in grade 2 the same form was sent asking the same. We still got nowhere. In grade 4 once again we were asked about Ukrainian, got nowhere. Now she's in grade 6 and again you ask if we want Ukrainian to be taught. Well people, get get off your fat asses and do something because you are asking the same questions and do nothing. At the rate you people move no wonder. I can see why Alberta and Manitoba have all these languages. Because someone up there gave a damn and did something about it. It has been a total run around here and by the looks of things it will indeed continue to be so."--Yorkton

Information collected on the response sheets and at the meetings also served to identify a variety of attitudinal, administrative, personnel, and resource-related barriers

to program implementation. Understandably, many of the barriers also appeared amongst the list of major concerns across the province with respect to heritage language instruction.

"The Department of Education should strive to sensitize school boards, teachers and parents to the possibilities of offering Heritage Language classes. . . to the inherent value of studying other languages and other cultures."--Swift Current

"The Department of Education should provide generous 'start-up' equipment, materials, and transportation grants to heritage language programs."--Saskatoon, session 1

"I have concerns with respect to receiving school board co-operation."--Saskatoon, session 1

"Government should support heritage language teaching through the employment of heritage language animators and consultants."--Regina, session 1

"School scheduling conflicts must be minimized. (A heritage language class should not be timetabled back-to-back with very popular electives."--Regina, session 1

"The universities must establish appropriate training programs for heritage language teachers."--Saskatoon, session 1

"The Departments of Education and Culture and Recreation and the Provincial Library should develop, collect and deliver heritage language related resource material."--Regina, session 2

"There should be more variety in teaching materials for heritage languages; more 'themes' should be developed. Quality materials are needed in order to make programs more interesting."--Cudworth

Table 4: ACOHL Community Meetings, 1984-85: Attendance, Petitions and Briefs

Community	*Attendance*	*Petitions/ Signators (Ukrainian)*	*Briefs*									
			D-F	El	Fr	Ge	Ic	Mo	Po	Uk	In	Or
Blaine Lake	26									1		
Canora	42	1/115								4		
Cudworth	7	3/154								1	2	
Foam Lake	9						1			1		
Hudson Bay	7									1		
Humboldt	11										1	
Kamsack	6				1							
Kerrobert	5											
Melville	13											
Moose Jaw	17					2						
Nipawin	2											
North Battleford	15									2		
Prince Albert	12									1		1
Regina	64		1	1		2				3		1
Rosthern	11										2	
Saskatoon	56	1/81		1		2			1	3	1	2
Swift Current	24							1			1	
Yorkton	60					1				1	1	
Totals	387		1	2	1	7	1	1	1	18	8	4

Key: D-F=Dutch-Flemish
El=East Indian
Fr=French
Ge=German
Ic=Icelandic
Po=Polish
Mu=Muslim
Uk=Ukrainian
In=Individual
Or=Organization (multilingual and/or multicultural)

Table 5: ACHOL Community Meetings, 1984-85: List of Presenters and Briefs by Community

Community	*Presenter*	*Brief No.*	*Title of Brief*
Blaine Lake	Ciona, P.	1	Green Grove Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church Camp
Canora	Danylchuk, H.	2	Ridni Shkoly
	Zawislak, A.	3	Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada, Maria Markovych Branch
	Harris, N.	4	Ukrainian Self-Reliance Association, Cheremosh-Hyas Parishes
	Ochitwa, M.	5	Ukrainian Orthodox Trident Church Camp
Cudworth	Bergerman, D.B.	6	Language Instruction in Cudworth School
	Chrun, D.	7	Cudworth Ukrainian Catholic Pastoral District
	student	8	quote from *Family Matters*
Foam Lake	Stephanson, E.B.	9	The Vatnabyggd Icelandic Club of Saskatchewan
	Popowych, B.	10	Holy Eucharist Parish of Foam Lake (Ukrainian Catholic)
Hudson Bay	Waskowic, L.	11	Ukrainian Women's Association
Humboldt	Redemann, K	12	individual (opinions on heritage language instruction)
Kamsack	Kostick, V.	13	Parents of Elementary School Children (French)
Moose Jaw	Temple, H.	14	Moose Jaw German Language School
	Materi, I.	15	German Canadian Club
North Battleford	Kozun, E.	16	The Battlefords Ukrainian Language Committee
	Kowal, M.	17	Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Saskatchewan Provincial Council, Saskatoon
Prince Albert	Nainaar, M.	18	Prince Albert Multicultural Council
	Zlipko, S.	19	The Prince Albert Parents' Association for English-Ukrainian Bilingual Education
Regina *1	Hoogeveen, D.	20	Dutch-Flemish Society of Saskatchewan
	Nottebrock, H.	21	Parents' Association of the German Language School, Regina
	Contz, H.	22	German-Canadian Society "Harmonie"
	Klapoushak, E.	23	Ukrainian Self-Reliance Association of Regina

Regina *2	Krenosky, E.	24	Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Regina Branch
	Hrycay, R.	25	Ukrainian Language Committee (Athabasca School)
	Narang, H.	26	National Association of Canadians of Origins in India, Regina Chapter
	Harras, T.E.	27	Multilingual Association of Regina
Rosthern	Zolkevich, J.	28	The Saskatchewan Valley School Division *49
	Ens, E.	29	Rosthern High School Summary of Students' Heritage Languages
Saskatoon *1	Javed, A.H.	30	The Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan
	Ruttiman, P.	31	The Saskatchewan German Council
	Karpinski, E.	32	The Polish Parents' Committee
Saskatoon *2	Stephan, A.	33	Saskatoon Multilingual School
	Kirmse, S.	34	individual (German)
	Maittul, R.	35	India Canadian Cultural Association (no written brief)
	Ryan, E.	36	German Language School (no written brief)
Saskatoon (PS)	Leson, H.	37	Mohyla Institute, Board of Directors
	Diduck, G.	38	Parents' Committee, St. Goretti Ukrainian-English Bilingual Program
	Wojchichowsky, E.	39	All Saints Parish Ukrainian School
Swift Current	Himour, A.	40	Muslim Association of Swift Current
	Heese, M.	41	individual (German)
Yorkton	Maksymiuk, M.	42	The Canadian-Ukrainian Community of Yorkton and District
	Haberstock, J.	43	Parkland German-Canadian Cultural Society
	Schmidt, M.	44	individual (excerpt from Dr. Wilder Penfield interview)

Key: Regina *1=Regina, session 1
Regina *2=Regina, session 2
Saskatoon *1=Saskatoon, session 1
Saskatoon *=Saskatoon, session 2
Saskatoon (PS)=Saskatoon, post-meeting submissions

Table 6: ACOHL Community Meetings, 1984-85: Ranking of Issues Raised at Public Meetings

*Issues**	‹—— *Ranking of Issues by Community* ——›											*Totals*		
	Ca	*C*	*H*	*M*	*MJ*	*R*1*	*R*2*	*S*1*	*S*2*	*SC*	*Y*	*X*	*TP*	*OR*
N=	42	7	11	13	17	43	21	37	19	24	60			
Awareness and Profile of Heritage Languages	3	1	2	2,4	3	2	1,4			1,2 4		**12**	**43**	**1**
Inter/intragovernmental Cooperation			5		2	1,3 5	2,3 5	3			5	**10**	**26**	**2.5**
Policy		1	1	3	4		4	1	5		4,5	**9**	**26**	**2.5**
Funding	2,5	1				4		5	1	3	3	**8**	**24**	**4**
University Involvement	1	2		5				4			2	**5**	**16**	**5.5**
Formal Training of Teachers	4							2,3	4	1		**5**	**16**	**5.5**
Programing		3	3	4	5						1	**5**	**14**	**7**
Support Services					1				2,3			**3**	**12**	**8**
Rationale			4	1							3	**3**	**10**	**9**
Access to Facilities									2	5		**2**	**5**	**10**

Key: Ca=Canora
C=Cudworth
H=Humboldt
M=Melville
MJ=Moose Jaw

R*1=Regina, session 1
R*2=Regina, session 2
S*1=Saskatoon, session 1
S*2=Saskatoon, session 2
SC=Swift Current
Y=Yorkton

N=number in attendance at each meeting
X=Times mentioned in top five issues
TP=total points (1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)
OR=overall ranking of issue
* for complete category descriptions see page 17

How to read table: Individuals attending the sessions in each community were asked to rank, in order of importance, the top five issues discussed at their meeting. The numbers in the columns below each community indicate the rankings that the communities gave various issues. For example, at the Swift Current meeting, three of the top five issues (numbers 1, 2 and 4) dealt with "awareness and profile of heritage languages."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The initial task assigned to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages required an assessment of the current status of heritage language instruction in the province and an identification of any existing issues and concerns. This report and these recommendations both result from three major committee activities:

- information gathering and analysis from external human and material resources
- internal research and deliberation
- public (consultation) involvement

While the first two activities served to establish a common point of reference for committee members, all agreed that public input was essential if truly "responsible" recommendations were to result.

In reviewing the findings, committee members determined that the issues identified could be classified according to ten broad categories. This "focusing" enabled the formation of individual and community concerns as expressed in written submissions and verbal presentations. Accompanying each recommendation is a statement of rationale and a sample of relevant public comments.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended the Department of Education develop a policy statement on multicultural education.

Rationale

The impetus for developing a comprehensive multicultural education policy comes from a growing awareness of the fact that we live in an increasingly pluralistic society. Multicultural education is the process of making the formal educational system more responsive to the cultural and linguistic diversity that characterize the students in our schools. Its objectives include assisting students to develop an appreciation and respect for their own culture and the cultural heritage of others, thereby facilitating achievement of several of the goal statements contained in Directions (1984):

> "Perceive self in a positive way."
>
> "Presents oneself with confidence and well-being." (Self-Concept Development)

"Respects and values family, religion, and culture in a pluralistic society" (Spiritual Development)

"Bases decisions and actions on the recognition that people differ in their values, behaviours, and lifestyles."

"Acts on the belief that each individual has value as a human being and should be respected as a worthwhile person."

"Interacts and feels comfortable with others who are different in race, religion, social level, or personal attributes." (Understanding and Relating to Others).

In sum, the goals of multicultural education include cultural preservation and development, the growth of a positive self-identity, and the enhancement of human and intergroup relations. Language teaching can contribute to the realization of all these goals.

"We wish to state our support for and belief in the proposition that Canada is and should be a multicultural nation. It follows that if Canada is to be a multicultural society, ethnocultural groups in Canada must be encouraged to preserve, develop and share their culture with Canadian society as a whole."

"Complementary parallel multicultural education thrusts that provide cultural content and encourage self-recognition and tolerance should be initiated."

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the Department of Education assume responsibility for all preschool and out-of-school, as well as K-12 language education in the province.

Rationale

The shift of responsibility for out-of-school heritage language programming from the Department of Culture and Recreation to the Department of Education, is predicated on the conviction that housing all heritage language programs in one government department would permit coordination and focusing of the program development, resource acquisition, teacher education, funding, and information dissemination efforts currently spread over two budget units. In this model, the role of out-of-school programs continues as an alternative or supplement to in-school instruction and is deemed indispensable.

"We urge that the Department of Education take the responsibility for all language education in Saskatchewan and work with local school boards to achieve this end."

"The Department of Education should assume responsibility for all heritage language instruction."

"We require Saturday schools to supplement the Heritage Language Program in school."

"The Department of Education should assume a supportive stance and take responsibility for out-of-school heritage language programs."

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that a second language, which may be a heritage language, a native Canadian language or an official language, be part of the compulsory core curriculum.

Rationale

The Curriculum and Instruction Review Committee was charged with the task of assessing the quality of education in Saskatchewan and establishing some direction for the future. One of the recommendations made in this Committee's final report--Directions--was that Saskatchewan endorse a new statement of educational goals. The Goals of Education for Saskatchewan statement was released in October, 1984, by the Minister of Education.

Another recommendation, suggesting that adoption of a K-12 core curriculum resulted in the formation of a Core Curriculum Policy Advisory Committee. "Core Curriculum" has been defined as a combination of:

1. the common essential learnings that flow across all areas of study K-12:

   - communication skills
   - critical and creative thinking
   - self-directed, life-long learning
   - numerical and quantitative literacy
   - personal and social skills and values
   - technological literacy, and

2. specific essential learnings, which are largely knowledge-based and organized around six major areas of study:

   - Language Arts
   - Mathematics
   - Science
   - Social Studies
   - Aesthetic Education
   - Physical Education

The common essential learnings emerge from the goals of education and represent factors common to all areas of study, while the specific essential learnings may be regarded as the vehicle through which common essential learnings are taught and learned.

The implementation of a core curriculum may be viewed as an attempt to ensure the occurrence of those learnings essential to the attainment of the goals of education

Many of the abilities developed through second-language education have a close relationship to a number of the common essential learnings, particularly:

- communication skills
- critical and creative thinking
- self-directed, life-long learning
- personal and social skills and values

Thus, one area of study (heritage-language education) has the potential to become the vehicle for teaching a number of common essential learnings. In the interest of efficiency alone, second language education should occupy an identifiable place in the compulsory core curriculum.

"Second (heritage) languages should be a part of the K-12 curriculum."

"We recommend that second-language instruction be compulsory in Division I rather than Division III."

"Emphasis should be placed on the continuity of programs once they are introduced. They should be compulsory through Division IV."

"Heritage language (K-12) programs should be implemented where numbers warrant."

"Timetabling should make it possible to learn both French and a Heritage Language."

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the Department of Education establish a Heritage Language Office to assume responsibility for all heritage language programming.

Rationale

A new office needs to be structured within the Department of Education and assigned the task of coordinating the housing and further development of all heritage language programming.

The development of instructional materials, heretofore initiated by special interest groups, needs to be focused and expanded; implementation procedures for moving many programs into the formal school program need to be spelled out, and research and development plans need to be formulated--as does an evaluation format.

It is in our best interest that we make optimum use of the funds available from other governments, government agencies and other groups. Informational, planning and promotional activities in this regard need to be coordinated.

Resource persons need to be employed to fulfill the many functions envisaged. The OMLO and/or the structure and initiatives of the Community Education Branch (as a result of the Report of the Native Curriculum Review Committee) could both be used as points of reference in developing the Heritage Language Office and legitimizing heritage-language education.

The functions of such an office might include:

- acquisition and development of instructional materials (Recommendation #5: Heritage Language Resource Centre)
- Liaison activities with community groups, internal government departments and agencies, and external agencies and government departments at the provincial, national, and international levels (Recommendation #6: Heritage Language Liaison Committee)
- program development and evaluation (Recommendation #7)
- planning and promotion with school boards and provincial and community ethnic groups and organizations
- dissemination of information about available program alternatives, implementation procedures, funding possibilities, and the benefits inherent in second-language learning and education.

"The Department of Education should assume leadership in co-ordinating the roles of various training, accrediting, and funding institutions."

"Establish appropriate structures and appoint sufficient support personnel to assure that heritage language education receives a realistic level of promotional, programme development and consultative service."

"The Department of Education provide authoritative information to the public regarding the value of second-language learning to combat the myths about the disadvantages of second-language learning."

"Sensitize the general public to the benefits inherent in heritage language education, particularly bilingual and immersion programming."

"Visible official support for heritage language instruction serves to legitimize the language in the eyes of the public and contributes to positive attitudes toward heritage languages."

"The Department of Education must publicly sanction heritage instruction. It must also be made perfectly clear that this is a right of parents."

"Information on transportation grants from the Department of Education should be readily available. Most people are unaware of any such grants."

"Initiate and conduct a detailed evaluation of student progress in the current Ukrainian--English Bilingual Programme in Saskatoon."

Recommendation 5

It is recommended that the Department of Education establish a Heritage Language Resource Centre, attached to and working in conjunction with the Heritage Languages Office.

Rationale

The unavailability of appropriate teaching and supplementary materials and a lack of knowledge about what already exists are two major problems confronting heritage language teaching.

Ongoing research and evaluation of new and existing heritage-language materials will result in a comprehensive cataloging of appropriate heritage language teaching and supplementary materials. The development and implementation of a mechanism to ensure that the interested public receives this information can do much to alleviate one aspect of the "materials" problem.

The mandate of the Centre might include:

- research and evaluation of heritage language related print, non-print, program and supplementary materials
- collection and cataloging of heritage language materials
- development and implementation of a public information strategy which might include a "mobile library" component.

The Departments of Education, and Culture and Recreation, and the Provincial Library should develop, collect and deliver heritage-language resource materials."

"A resource centre for heritage languages should be established by the Department of Education."

"The Department of Education should also be a resource centre for all language teachers by providing materials such as books, tapes, filmstrips, and films."

"The Department of Education should produce children's programs."

Recommendation 6

It is recommended that the Department of Education establish a Heritage Language liaison Committee to serve a public relations function between the Heritage Language Office and the general public.

Rationale

Heritage language education needs and expectations can be identified most readily by those most directly affected. Such individuals, groups and agencies require access to policy makers and implementers who, in turn, need to hear the wishes of the public whom they are to serve.

Optionally, the liaison Committee may be consulted by the Heritage Language Office on matters of heritage language policies and programs. Membership should include those individuals, groups and agencies which have an interest in and/or responsibility for heritage language education.

"A permanent heritage language liaison committee should be established . This body could facilitate communication between in-school and out-of-school teaching situations."

"The government should continue to ask for input from Saskatchewan citizens regarding the development of programs."

"The Department of Education should establish a Community Liaison Committee with school Boards, trustees, teachers, and administrators, (as well as parents and ethnocultural groups)."

"The support structure at the Department of Education will help the Community Liaison Committee to consult and deal with local school boards ...."

Recommendation 7

1. It is recommended that the Department of Education commit itself to the provision of a full range of programs for teaching heritage languages, and to the acquisition or development of appropriate instructional materials.

2. It is further recommended that existing regulations be modified to permit early full immersion programs in heritage languages.

3. It is recommended that the Saskatchewan Government Correspondence School acquire or develop a wide range of heritage language programs, and that the curricula and instructional materials be consistent with the approach to second language teaching used in regular K-12 programs.

Rationale

Current legislation and regulations should not limit heritage language immersion possibilities. Public statements about the equality of educational opportunities and the "development of the potential of each person to the fullest extent" (Goals of Education--1984) become empty rhetoric without fundamental enabling legislation.

The demography and geography of Saskatchewan preclude the widespread use of heritage languages for instructional purposes in K-12 bilingual or immersion programs. In many school jurisdictions, only core or extended core programs may be feasible. In others, out-of-school and correspondence programs may be the only heritage learning opportunity available. Program and instructional development must proceed a pace in all of these delivery modes.

The crux of the program development is the judicious selection or preparation of linguistic and cultural instructional materials consistent with multicultural education principles and standards. The Department is looked to for leadership with respect to materials selection and preparation. Interprovincial co-operation and joint development projects supported by the Department of the Secretary of State are seen as ways of expediting this process.

> "The Department of Education must also play a more active role in curriculum and materials development in the Heritage Language area."
>
> "The department of Education needs to maintain, expand and revise curricula for core language programs so that these can be offered in areas where bilingual programs cannot be implemented."
>
> "The Department of Education should encourage the establishment of bilingual or immersion heritage language schools."
>
> "Immersion heritage language programs are important--an effective way of teaching languages."
>
> "We need a suitable K-12 delivery system (including correspondence courses) that meet varied needs."
>
> "We recommend that the number of heritage languages which can be studied through the Saskatchewan Correspondence School be considerably increased to permit more students to take these languages as an option."
>
> "We recommend that Correspondence School courses be improved to make teaching of languages more effective. Presently, Correspondence School courses are a last resort (better than nothing)."

Recommendation 8

It is recommended that the Department of Education expand its current system of granting a credit standing to accommodate students obtaining heritage language instruction through "out-of-school" heritage language programs.

Rationale

Students obtain Departmental credits for language courses offered through the regular instructional system or through "credit-granting" programs. However, the number of Saskatchewan schools offering language instruction other than English and French is very limited. For many students, their only access to language courses is through out-of-school heritage language programs, many of which currently do not carry a credit standing.

> "A means should be established whereby students of out-of-school heritage language programs can obtain credit for that language at the high school level."
>
> "Accreditation for out-of-school classes should be regularized along with teacher certification."
>
> "A definite policy and procedure need to be established so that students studying a heritage language in an out-of-school situation may receive credit."

Recommendation 9

It is recommended that the Department of Education encourage school boards to make facilities and equipment available, at no cost, to organizations conducting "out-of-school" heritage language programs.

Rationale

Although provisions currently exist within the Saskatchewan Education Act and its accompanying regulations for heritage language instruction, school boards provide relatively few opportunities for students to acquire a heritage language. Therefore, in most cases, organizations offering heritage language instruction to students are delivering a service not provided through the regular instructional system. Since facilities and equipment are funded through grants from the Department of Education and the local taxation base, it is appropriate that organizations not be assessed rental fees for providing heritage language instruction.

> "Adequate facilities to house out-of-school classes needing space be provided free of charge with access to office spaces and services, storage, etc., and that language laboratories and audio/visual materials be made available to them."

"There should be free access to school facilities for conducting heritage language classes."

"Permanent location for heritage language school with access to educational equipment."

"The Department of Education should facilitate relationships between 'cultural schools' and local boards of education."

Recommendation 10

It is recommended to the College of Education (University of Saskatchewan), the Faculty of Education (University of Regina), and language departments at these universities that:

1. teacher education programs be developed and implemented for students preparing to teach in K-12 core and immersion programs.

2. every student in teacher education programs be sensitized to the multicultural nature of our society.

Rationale

1. Although German and Ukrainian have been taught in Saskatchewan schools since 1913 and 1951, respectively, methodology courses in teacher education programs are virtually non-existent. Since 1979 a half-course in teaching Ukrainian at all grades levels and in both core and bilingual programs has been offered on an occasional basis, usually through the Division of Extension and Community Relations. There are no faculty positions allocated to Heritage Language Education.

It is vital that the preparation of heritage language teachers include courses in language and culture, as well as methods of teaching language and culture, and that special attention be given to the use of a heritage language as a medium of instruction. Inter-university co-operation within and outside the province and with the Department of the Secretary of State is essential if adequate programs are to be developed.

2. All teachers must be aware of the historical and sociological contexts of heritage language teaching in this province, and of its legitimacy in a multicultural country, in order that the school environment be conducive to heritage language programming.

Supporting quotations for 1:

"Appropriate training for heritage language teachers must be established at universities."

"Teacher training institutions should provide methodological courses in the teaching of heritage languages and cultures."

"Language and culture are very closely linked, and both should be taught."

Supporting quotations for 2:

"The argument: Many people say that their heritage language is unnecessary to their functioning as a person and as a citizen, and so has little interest in them is to be expected [sic]. What can one expect when for the past one hundred years, it has been 'drummed' into them that they were not in their homeland, and that they must forget that past, adapt themselves to Canada and its way of life--including language, and that only in this way can they prove themselves worthy of being true and loyal Canadians. The question here arises--What and who is a Canadian? What are the criteria by which a person is judged a true and loyal Canadian?"

"There still exist in our communities the hangover from the past historical treatment of ethnocultural groups in Canada."

Recommendation 11

It is recommended that the Department of Education develop a system of training and certification for "out-of-school" heritage language teachers.

Rationale

Presently, a heritage language group must acquire the services of a teacher with a Saskatchewan teaching certificate in order that the students who enrol in "out-of-school" heritage language classes may obtain credit (Grades 10-12) for their efforts. The erroneous assumption underlying this situation is that the "certified" teacher has completed some training in heritage language teaching. In fact, no heritage language methods classes are available at either university campus, with one exception of a periodic offering of a half-course in Ukrainian language teaching methods at the University of Saskatchewan.

This same stipulation further limits teacher availability because it disqualifies those heritage language teachers who may have received methodology training elsewhere, but whose credentials are inconsistent with the requirements for a Saskatchewan teaching certificate.

Proper training must be made available for both "heritage language teacher" categories.

> "The Department of Education should provide for and formalize out-of-school heritage language training."
>
> "There should be special certification for fluent 'non-teachers'."
>
> "Governments should provide a formal training program for teachers teaching outside of the school system--and provide for some sort of certification for these teachers."

Recommendation 12

It is recommended that the Department of Education, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Universities of Saskatchewan and Regina co-operate in the establishment of in-service training programs for both "in-school" and "out-of-school" heritage language teachers.

Rationale

In-service training for out-of-school heritage language teachers is currently provided by the Saskatchewan Organization for Heritage Languages through funding from the federal Department of the Secretary of State and the provincial Department of Culture and Recreation. The non-credit weekend workshops provide training in the areas of methodology and classroom management. Similarly, Special Subject Councils of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation have planned and delivered in-service workshops for "in" and "out-of-school" German and Ukrainian heritage language teachers.

Increased demands by both "in" and "out-of-school" teachers for in-service training requires a systematic approach to establishing and implementing generally recognized heritage language teacher training programs.

> "Although these workshops provide useful ideas for volunteer community teachers, it would be more beneficial if a regular credit course on the teaching of heritage languages is offered by the universities to improve the quality of heritage language training."

"The Department of Education must provide for in-service of teachers involved in second language instruction in the form of seminars and financial aid such as scholarships, travel grants and bursaries."

"Pre-service and in-service training of heritage language teachers needs to be formalized. For example, university and correspondence courses should be established whereby the teachers can learn or upgrade skills. The program should be sufficiently extensive to permit eventual certification of teachers for out-of- school heritage language teaching. Appropriate incentives for teachers to take these courses and to teach classes need to be established and supported on an ongoing basis."

Recommendation 13

It is recommended that bursary programs and teacher training programs in other countries be available to heritage language teachers

Rationale

The existing Department of Education Teacher Bursary Program eligibility rules are limiting. To qualify, a teacher must be under contract with a Saskatchewan Board of Education for the current academic year to teach in the area of study approved for bursary support (i.e., heritage language). This completely eliminates "out-of-school" teacher participation.

A heritage language teacher must know the language, understand the culture and receive training in methods of teaching both the language and the culture. Teacher training programs, particularly in the country in which the target language is spoken, represent an excellent means of dealing with all three requirements.

The federal Republic of Germany, through its Goethe Institute, sponsors annual summer immersion seminars for German language teachers abroad. These seminars are designed to improve language, develop insight into culture and provide some methodological training. They could serve as a model for future teacher training programs. No formal arrangements currently exist between the Province of Saskatchewan and any other country.

"A program of out-of-school teacher upgrading must begin immediately."

"The Department of Education should support heritage language teacher training. This support could include bursaries for university language, culture and methods classes for teacher apprenticeship."

"We recommend that exchange programs exist in order to improve qualifications of teachers and provide teaching materials."

Recommendation 14

It is recommended that the Department of Education co-operate with the Universities and the Department of Education in the three prairie provinces in offering credit summer programs for heritage language teachers.

Rationale

At the present time, no heritage language teacher education programs exist at either university campus.

A joint interprovincial summer program is a viable alternative for heritage language teacher education. It facilitates a potentially broader teacher participation, maximizes access to human resources by drawing on the instructional expertise from three provinces and represents a potential saving in time and money to each province.

There is a precedent for this type of co-operation. A three-week total immersion Ukrainian teacher education course was conducted in Saskatoon (1982) for teachers from the three prairie provinces. Similar interprovincial co-operation led to the offering of a four-week summer session (two full classes) in Winnipeg (1983). In both cases, participants received credit from their home university.

"Intergovernmental (provincial and federal) co-operation in heritage language teaching could prove to be very beneficial to all concerned."

Recommendation 15

It is recommended that the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina:

1. require students to have a second language--both as an entrance and as a graduation requirement.

2. establish a Chair of Multicultural Studies.

3. strengthen their offerings in languages, and in the culture and history of ethnic groups.

4. play a leading role in establishing further links with post-secondary institutions in other countries.

Rationale

The two universities play an important role in the preservation of the linguistic and multicultural nature of the province. These institutions should initiate and develop programs of study that reflect provincial multicultural realities and reinforce official government policies. Furthermore, the government should recognize the importance of ethnic studies by providing funding to the universities for this purpose.

Every graduate should have acquired the essential elements of a liberal education, one of which is language.

In a pluralistic society ethnocultural groups are encouraged to preserve, develop and share their cultures. The understanding of a culture and its traditions is derived, in part, from a knowledge of the language and the literary works of its writers.

A primary objective of Canada's multicultural policy is to ensure the cultural freedom of ethnic minorities. A critical aspect of providing support to ethnocultural groups who manifest the will to survive is the establishment of ethnic studies programs at universities. A Chair of Multicultural Studies would provide the impetus for the development of language, culture, history, literature and fine arts courses that would permit students to extend and refine their knowledge of their ancestral language and cultures and to gain an understanding and appreciation of the cultures of the ethnic groups that comprise our population. Moreover, such courses would enrich emerging multicultural and intercultural components of teacher education programs, increase the pool of second language teachers and provide a foundation for multicultural education in the K-12 school system.

Existing official agreements with universities in other countries should be extended and expanded. The exchange of students, staff and instructional materials would prove most beneficial to the area of heritage study.